

**ADDITIONAL DISSENTING VIEWS TO H.R. 2341**  
**BY CONGRESSWOMAN ZOE LOFGREN**

Section 4 of this bill has a far more reaching effect than “federalizing” Consumer Protection Class Actions. Section 4 “federalizes” any state cause of action that is brought on behalf of the general public.

California, like many other states, has enacted strong antitrust laws that prohibit unfair combinations and unlawful restraints of trade. California has chosen to allow its District Attorneys, along with the California Attorney General, to enforce these laws in state courts.

This bill usurps California’s choice. Under Section 4(a)’s expansive definition of “class action,” a District Attorney who attempts to enforce state antitrust laws on behalf of the general public is subject to the Act’s constraints.

The federal government should not be forcing local prosecutors to try state antitrust lawsuits in federal court. Nor should the federal government force local prosecutors to comply with federal class certification requirements or risk dismissal of their state antitrust actions.

Put simply, H.R. 2341 is a stealthy attempt to chill state and local antitrust law enforcement. That effort is contrary to long-standing legal doctrines of our nation. It will also adversely impact competition and business development in the high tech sector, which is vital to this nation’s future. I, therefore, strongly oppose H.R. 2341.